

Serial No. 10/210,142
Xiao et al
Case No. CE09098R

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-18 are currently pending.

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-15 and 17-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant notes with appreciation that the subject matter of these claims is deemed to be allowable if rewritten to include all limitations of the superseding and rejected claims. Applicant wishes to reserve the right to rewrite these claims, should further discussions regarding the base and superseding claims prove unrewarding.

In the Office Action, claims 3-6 and 12-15 are objected to as containing certain informalities. In particular, it is noted that the sequence number of (e1) to (e11) is missing step (e4). Applicants have renumbered the sequence of steps to include an (e4). Thus, the steps are now (e1) to (e10). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims have the correct format.

Claims 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. In particular, it is stated that the term "computer program product" is unclear to be either a software program or a computer program system. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion of a computer program system to more accurately define the invention. This change has been made to claims 10 and 16 as well as the claims that depend upon them. In addition, the terms "a medium for embodying a computer program . . ." and "a computer program embodied on the medium . . ." are stated to be unclear. Applicants appreciate the suggestion made by Examiner to clarify this language and have made the appropriate changes to claims 10 and 16. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 16 are definite. Applicants therefore request that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner,

the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

By: Simon B. Anolick

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750